

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/936,064	CORRE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Michael I Poe	1732	

Status of Application: Amended (After Non-Final Rejection)

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 12:00 pm

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Part I.

The combinations of Knowles et al., Everson et al., Boyle and Blackmore previously presented.

1-10, 12 and 13

Knowles et al., Everson et al., Boyle and Blackmore

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner faxed proposed amendments to the applicant's attorney for review and approval on November 30, 2004 (see attached). The applicant's attorney called the examiner back on December 2, 2004 to discuss these proposed amendments. The examiner first stipulated that the proposed changes were necessary to better distinguish the independent claims over the prior art of record and to clarify the claims. In this regard, the examiner stipulated that claims 1 and 10 as amended by the response filed on September 27, 2004 do not distinguish over the prior art of record because the combination of Knowles et al, Everson et al. and Boyle teaches the use of a resin capable of being cured at ambient temperature (see column 1, lines 16-53 and column 9, lines 50-57 of Everson et al.) and because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to cure such a resin in the combined process by heating to accelerate curing as was well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention. However, the examiner further stipulated that the attorney's arguments with regard to claims 5 and 12 in the response filed on September 27, 2004 were persuasive. As such, the examiner had proposed amending independent claims 1 and 10 to include all of the limitations of dependent claims 5 and 12, respectively, and therefore had proposed the cancellation of claims 5 and 12. In view of the examiner's stipulations, the applicant's attorney argued that the addition of heating by electrical resistive elements incorporated into the filamentary reinforcement without the addition of heating by the Joule effect would be sufficient to distinguish the independent claims over the prior art of record. Since the examiner found this argument persuasive, it was agreed that heating by the Joule effect would be removed from the examiner's proposed amendments of claims 1 and 10 and would remain in dependent claims 5 and 12 (e.g., claims 5 and 12 would be amended appropriately instead of being cancelled). It was further agreed that the remaining changes to the claims were only necessary to clarify the language of the claims. Refer to the examiner's amendment for a complete listing of changes to the claims.